**NEO-CLASSICAL OR HUMAN RELATIONS THEORY**

The Human Relations Theory of organisation came into existence in 1930s as a reaction to the classical approach to organisational analysis. The classical thinkers like Taylor, Fayol, Gulick, Urwick and Weber stressed the formal structure of the organisation and neglected the role of human element in the organisation. In other words, they took a mechanistic view of the organisation and under-emphasised the sociological and psychological aspects of individual's behaviour in the organisation. It is this critical failure on the part of the classical approach which gave rise to the human relations approach. Human relations theory is also known as Humanistic Theory, Socio-Economic Theory and Neo-classical Theory.

The coming of the Human Relations school of Management Thought together with the Behavioural School led to the discovery of not only that there are human beings in organizations but also that they often behave in the most unpredictable ways. Hence the essence of the human relations theory lies in its primary emphasis on human beings, psychological motivations and informal group behavior, in contradiction to the structuralisms‘ exclusive concern for principles of organization. This theory or approach focuses on management as a web of interpersonal relationships. It lays greater stress on the behavior of role occupants in an organization than on the formal structure of the organization. The advocates of this school argue that since management and administration involve group effort and collective endeavors of people, the study of management must be centered on the individual as socio-psychological being and are more concerned with his motivations. They view human relations as the heart of the task of management; other equates management with leadership. The underlying emphasis of all these views is that the solution of the problems of management can be found in the realm of social psychology.

**THE HAWTHORN EXPERIMENT AND OTHER CONTRIBUTERS**

The greatest single influence of the human relations theory came from the Hawthorn experiments which were carried out in the USA by Elton Mayo and his colleagues of the Harvard Business School in the late twenties and early thirties of this century. The findings were first published in management and the worker (F.J. Roethlisberger and William J. Dickson) in 1939. The Hawthorn studies carried out at the Western Electric Company in the USA is a historic landmark in organizational theory, since it helped to develop the Human Relations School of Organization. The immediate objective of the study was to measure the effect of improved lighting on workers‘ output, and the psychological and social problems of industrial workers.

The principal people involved in human relation era were Elton mayo- a psychologist and fritz poethlisberger- a sociologist. Others were willian dicksson, elliot jaques, Marry parker Follet etc. these individuals were primarily or more specifically the effects of working conditions on productivity.

Beginning in 1924 a series of experiments were at the Hawthorne Branch of the Western Electric Company in Cicero Illinois State of U.S. the experiment continued over several years lasting into the early 1930s Elton Mayo has often been referred to as the founder of both human relations school and of industrial sociology.

**Elton Mayo 1880 - 1949**

Elton mayo was a psychologist, a philosopher, an Australian by birth, trained as a medical student but left it and followed his interest in psychology and philosophy. He joined the staff of Harvard University in 1926 in U.S. and eventually becoming a professor of industrial Research at Harvard Graduate School of Business Studies. His interest has primarily been in the peoples in organization.

Elton Mayo, is regarded as the 'father of human relations theory'. He concentrated on the study of workers' behaviour and the production capacity, taking into consideration physiological, physical, economic, social and psychological aspects. He called this approach a "clinical method".

Elton Mayo‘s major works are: The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization (1933), The Social Problems of an Industrial Civilization (1945), and The Political Problems of an Industrial Civilization (1947).

The other writers who contributed to the growth of human relations theory includes F.J.

Roethlisberger, William J. Dickson, T. North Whitehead, W. Lloyd, E. Warner and LJ.

Henderson.

**Mayo’s Most Famous Early Experiment – The Mule Spinning Enquiry**

He undertook the first research programme in 1923 and 24 in a textile mill near Philadelphia and named it "The First Enquiry". Its purpose was to identify the cause of high labour turnover in the Mule Spinning Department. Turnover in other departments was between 5 and 6% a year but as high as 250% in the Mule Spinning Department. Why so? He asked. Mule is a spinning machine in the textile industry.

Mayo decided to introduce two minute rest periods, one in the morning and two more in the afternoon for one of the groups in the department with astounding result. Morals improved, high turnover ended, and production, despite the work breaks, remained the same. Soon the entire department (i.e. all the groups in the department) were included in the rest period experiment, and output increased tremendously. Monthly productivity, which had never been above 70%, rose over the next five months to an overall average of 80%, and with this increase came bonus pay, which was given for productivity over 75%

Mayo felt that it was the systematic introduction of the rest periods which helped to overcome physical fatigue leading to the high morale, high productive, and virtual elimination of labour turnover.

In a nutshell, like most of his colleague mayo‘s initial interests were in fatigue, working conditions, rest periods, accident and labour turnover. Also paramount in his research was the importance of group in affecting the behaviour of individuals at work which enabled him to make certain deductions about what managers ought to do.

After this pioneering work of Mayo came the Hawthorn studied of which Mayo himself was one of the experimental with others, although Mayo was not the originator of the Hawthorn studies or even one of the chief researchers. He only joined the Harvard University industrial research faculty in 1926. He then conducted the Hawthorne Experiment together with the Harvard associates.

**The Hawthorne Studies (1924-1932)**

The Hawthorne studies formed the basis for the rise of human relations theory. These studies shook the foundations of classical approach, that is, the concept of economic man and the role of the structure of formal organisation.

These studies were conducted in the Western Electric Company at Hawthorne (near Chicago—USA) by the Harvard Business School under the leadership of Elton Mayo. The studies were conducted in the following four phases.

i. **Illumination Experiment**, (1924—27), to determine the effect of different levels of illumination on workers' productivity.

In this experiment, some workers were placed under different light intensities starting with high light in their working place. The workers increased their output. The light intensity was adjusted downwards at different stages of the experiment but productivity continued to increase. The experimenters were baffled to get result contrary to their expectation. The workers productivity reduced only when the light was reduced to moonlight level. This indicated that there is no much correlation between lighting and productivity. The workers output continued to be high despite the reduction of the light intensity until it reached moonlight level. The indication, here, is that the workers were motivated psychologically by their being recognized for an experiment among others.

ii. **Relay Assembly Test Room Experiment** (1927), to observe the effects of various changes in working conditions on the workers' output and morale,

In this experiment, some female workers (experimental group) were isolated from the rest (control group) and placed under observation with special good working conditions. Their level of productivity under diverse working conditions was carefully measured. But under all physical changes in their work environment (like less or more room lighting, rest pauses in work etc), the production by these girls showed a continually upward rise. This proved that there was no positive correlation between the working conditions and productivity, invalidating another Taylorian dictum, and this greatly puzzled the researchers. However, the reason for the behavior of the female workers seemed hardly surprising on further analysis. The girls were conscious of the fact that they had been selected for a special experiment. Hence, it was little wonder that they tried to give their best performance.

iii. **Mass Interviewing programme** (1928-31), to explore the employees' feelings (i.e. human attitudes and sentiments) by talking to them (ventilation therapy).

iv. **Bank Wiring Experiment** (1931-32), to understand better how the norms that controlled each member's output, were established by the worker's social group (informal organisation).

In this experiment workers operating under a piece-rate system were observed to see whether higher wages motivated them to work more. The group established their own norms and set their own standards of performance different from that of their organization. A high performing worker was named a *Rate Buster*, a low performing worker was named *Chiseller* and the worker who carried information of workers to management was named *Squealer*.

The researchers were considerably surprised to find that the workers worked to a point they felt would ensure them of an adequate income, and then refused to work more, thus giving a lie to a well-known Taylorian principle. The main reason for this unexpected behavior was the underlying fears that overproduction may lead to retrenchment, a situation which any of them might have to face. The researchers discovered that the workers were a well-knit social group who were governed by their own code of work ethics informally agreed to by all members.

The above are explained in the Management and the Worker published in 1939 by

Roethlisberger and Dickson. The conclusions of the Hawthorne studies are:

i. The social and psychological factors at the workplace, and not the physical conditions of work, determine the employees' morale and output. This is the most important finding.

ii. The organisation is a social system.

iii. Non-economic rewards and sanctions significantly affect the workers' behaviour, morale and output.

iv. Workers are not inert or isolated, unrelated individuals; they are social animals.

v. Division of labour strictly on specialisation is not necessarily the most efficient approach.

vi. The workers have a tendency to form small social groups (informal organisations). The production norms and behavioural patterns are set by such groups.

vii. Workers react to management as members of the informal work groups rather than as individuals,

viii. Leadership, style of supervision, communication and participation play a central role in workers' behaviour, satisfaction and productivity.

Thus, the findings of Hawthorne studies were highly startling and revolutionised the organisational thought. They gave rise to a new theory called Human Relations Theory.

The Hawthorne experiments proved that men are not atomistic or voluntarisitc creatures, but are motivated by a variety of factors (not purely economic) in work, and are influenced by their social environment. These studies proved that organizations are social systems comprising thinking and acting individual. If further disclosed the tendency of workers to form small informal social groups with their own code of ethics and conduct in matters of work, behavior, beliefs and goals which may be often different from the goals of management and the stated objectives of the organization.

The human relations theory of organization considers the informal, day-to-day functioning of the structure of an organization more revealing than the mechanistic study of structure and principles of organization. It assumes that the study of organizational behavior is a very complex process which has to take into account, both the economic and the non-economic variables. For a realistic analysis of workers‘ behavior, all the factors motivating them have to be studied.

**Ideas of Mary Parker Follett**

Follett (1868-1933) is regarded as a bridge between the classical approach and the behavioural-human relations approach to organisation. Unlike other contemporary theorists, she viewed organisation as a social system and administration as a social process. She highlighted, for the first time, the sociological and psychological dimensions of administration and management. She brought out the human dimension of organisation and pointed out the role of situational factors on organisational behaviour. Hence, Follett is looked at as the precursor (forerunner) of the behavioural-human relations approach to organisational analysis. Danial A Wren says that, "Chronologically, she belonged to the scientific management era and philosophically social man era' As a classical thinker she believed in the universality of her principles of organization and as a behaviouralist-human relationist, she emphasised the significance of socio-psychological aspects of organisational behaviour. Urwick and Matcalf observed, "her conceptions were in advance of her time. They are still in advance of current thinking. But they are a goldmine of suggestions for any one who is interested in the problems of establishing and maintaining human cooperation in the conduct of an enterprise."

Folett criticised the classical theory of administration mainly for its mechanical approach and for neglecting psychological dimensions of organisational behaviour. Her major works include:

*i. The Speaker of the House of Representatives (1896)*

*ii. The New State (1920)*

*iii. Creative Experience (1924)*

*iv. Dynamic Administration (1941).*

The various concepts and principles enunciated by Follett can be discussed under the following heads:

**Conflict and Integration**

To Follett, conflicts in organisations are inevitable due to individual differences. Conflict is not warfare but is only an appearance of difference of opinions and interests among different categories of people in the organisation. Hence, conflicts should be conceived as not wasteful and harmful but as a normal process and should be handled in a constructive way.

Thus, Follett propounded the concept of 'constructive conflict'. This constitutes a positive approach to the resolution of conflict in order to realise organisational goals.

*Ways of Resolving Conflict*

Follet suggested three ways for resolving conflict in the organisation, viz.,

i. Domination—Victory of one side over the other.

ii. Compromise—Both sides surrendering some part of what they want.

iii. Integration—Finding a new solution which satisfies the 'real needs' of both sides and neither side sacrifices anything.

*Merits of Integration*

Of the three, Follett considered integration as the best way of resolving conflict due to its merits, viz.,

i. It resolves once and for all the original conflict as it goes to the root of the problem.

ii. It makes use of better techniques and saves time and resources.

iii. It leads to the emergence of new values and develops a new situation.

*Steps for Achieving Integration*

Follett also suggested the various steps in the achievement of integration. They , in order, are:

i. each side should recognise for itself as to what its real needs are and bring the differences into the open

ii. breaking down whole demands into their constituent parts,

iii. examining the real meaning of symbols

iv. preparation for the response of the other side.

*Obstacles to Integration*

Integration, though the most satisfying way to end conflicts, is not the easiest way. There are, according to Follett, several obstacles to it, viz.,

i. it requires a high degree of intelligence, keen perception and discrimination and a brilliant inventiveness which are rare among administrators,

ii. most people are habituated to enjoy domination over others,

iii. people theorize instead of suggesting active steps,

iv. obsession of managers with power and most of them try to get power-over,

v. language used which arouses antagonism,

vi. people are not trained in making integrations—the most important obstacle integration.

**The Giving of Orders**

Like Taylor, Fayol, Gulick, Urwick and other classical thinkers, Follett also accepted the need for giving orders in the organisation. In fact, she even suggested the four steps in giving of orders:

i. a conscious attitude—to know the different principles which underline giving orders.

ii. a responsible attitude—to identify those principles which should become the basis of giving order,

iii. an experimental attitude—to make experiments to analyse the success or failure of orders,

iv. a result attitude—to pool the results to change the extent and manner of giving orders if the existing methods are found insufficient.

To Follett, giving of orders is not a simple affair as people resent being bossed over. Hence, the job of a superior is not merely giving orders; he should learn to manipulate subordinates so that they accept orders without questioning. Habit patterns, mental attitudes, time, place and circumstances are important variables governing both giving and receiving of orders.

To Follett, one should avoid the two extremes, that is, too much of bossism in giving orders and practically not giving orders at all. The answer to this problem lies, according to Follet, in depersonalising the giving of orders. In her words, "My solution is to depersonalise the giving of orders, to unite all concerned in a study of the situation, to

discover the law of the situation and obey that". This way nobody gives orders to anybody. Both accept the orders given by the situation. Order, therefore, should come from action and not action from orders. This is 'depersonalisation of orders' or exercise of authority of the situation.

Though Follett's depersonalisation of orders is not different from the mechanisitic approach of classical theorists, she differed from them by highlighting the human dimension of administration. To resolve this paradox, Follett talked of 'repersonalising'.

**New Concept of Power**

According to Follett, power is "the ability to make things happen, to be a casual agent, to initiate change." She distinguished between 'power-over and 'power-with'. Power-over is less advantageous than power-with. It means asserting oneself and forcing another to do one's will. It leads to resentment and reaction. However, it can not be get rid of and hence should be reduced. The ways of reducing power-over, according to Follett are:

i. The use of integration (the solution that meets the real needs of both sides).

ii. The correct use of circular behaviour.

iii. The use of the law of the situation.

Follett said that a superior does not share power with his immediate subordinates. But he can give them opportunities for developing their powers. He can encourage them to integrate their activities so as to achieve ‗jointly developed power'. In this way, power-with leads to more power than power-over.

Power-with is more advantageous than power-over. It is a self-developing entity. It encourages cooperative effort, promotes superior understanding and reduces conflict. Power-over is an independent power which is used only for the benefit of the individual or group using it. Power-with or joint-power arises when two individuals or groups pool their power to arrive at a settlement satisfactory to both. In brief, power-over is a coercive-ower while power-with is jointly developed coactive-power. Follett argued that power-with must replace power-over.

**Authority and Responsibility**

As in the case of power, here also Follett made a radical departure from the classical administrative thought and developed new concepts of authority and responsibility.

Follett made a distinction between power and authority. She defined authority as vested power, the right to develop and exercise power. Authority is derived from the function or the job performed and not from the position held. In other words, "authority belongs to the job and stays with the job". Hence, one who does the job must have the authority whether the superior likes it or not. As authority belongs to the function (job), it cannot be delegated. The term 'delegation of authority' is thus an. 'obsolete expression'. She asserted, ―Authority must be functional and functional authority carries with it

responsftility. She, therefore, advocated the idea of 'functional authority' or 'pluralistic authority' or 'cumulative authority' and rejected the idea of final (ultimate) authority' as an illusion. The real authority in the organisation is the sum of all the smaller authorities

as authority is interwoven at various levels of the organisation.

Responsibility, like authority, is an attribute of the function and situation in the organisation, Follett said, it is a question of "for what is one responsible" rather than "to whom is one responsible". She, therefore, advocated the idea of 'functional responsibility' or 'pluralistic responsibility' or 'cumulative responsibility or group responsibility' and rejected the idea of 'final responsibility' as an illusion. Pluralistic responsibility connotes two things: one, lower level executives' participation in policy-formulation, and two, workers' participation in management.

With regard to her ideas on 'control' also, Follett differed from Taylor, Fayol, Gulick, Urwick and other theorists. She advocated 'correlated-control' rather than 'super-imposed control' and 'fact-control' rather than 'man-control'. Thus, control in the organisation is cumulative and pluralistic and not concentrated at the top level.

**Leadership**

According to Follett, a leader is not the head of the department or president of the organisation, but one "who can see all around a situation, who sees it as related to certain purposes and policies, who sees it evolving into the next situation, who understands how to pass from one situation to another." He is "the man who can show that the order is integral to the situation," Follett stated that such people are found not only at the top but throughout the organisation.

Follett opined that the leader not only influences his group but is also influenced by it. She called this reciprocral relationship as 'circular response'. Further, the leader must also be influenced by the experts within the organisation. Finally, the function of the leader is to create group power (power-with) rather than to exercise personal power (power-over).

Follett distinguished between the following three types of leadership:

i. Leadership of position—the leader holds a position of formal authority.

ii. Leadership of personality—the leader holds forceful personal qualities, (iii) Leadership of function—the leader holds both position and personality.

Follett said that only those people who possess functional knowledge, lead in the modern organisations and not those who possess formal position or forceful personality. She viewed that for the successful operation of an organisation, it must be "sufficiently flexible to allow the leadership of function to operate fully—to allow the men with the knowledge and the technique to control the situation." According to Follett, the functions of leadership are;

Coordination—to integrate different parts and weld them into effective unity.

ii. Definition of purpose—to clearly set the pattern and objectives of the organisation.

iii. Anticipation—to have insight into and faith in the future. It is 'making' the next situation and not only 'meeting' the next situation.

iv. To organise the experience of the group, make it all available and most effectively available and transform it into group-power.

v. To develop leadership among the subordinates, a leader should teach and train his subordinates how to control a situation themselves.

Follett believed that, leaders are not only born but can be made. She rejected the so-called 'intangible capacity‘ of leader and asserted that leadership can be learned.

**Planning and Coordination**

Follett established a close nexus between planning and coordination. In fact, coordination as a principle of planning figured prominently in her-work. She felt that the central planning imposed from the national level over the local level is doomed to failure due to lack of coordination, that is, "harmonious ordering of parts". Hence, central planning should be a mechanism to facilitate the coordinating process. She postulated four fundamental principles of coordination.

*(i) Coordination by Direct Contact:* The responsible people should be in direct contact with one another regardless of their position in the organisational ladder. Horizontal Communication is as important as vertical chain of command in achieveing coordination.

*(ii) Coordination in the Early Stages:* The people concerned should be involved in the policy-making stage itself rather than at the later stage of implementation. Such an early participation results in increased motivation and higher morale. This vital principle is largely ignored in the central planning.

iii. *Coordination as a Continuing Process:* Follett viewed coordination as a continuous process, is, from planning to activity, and from activity to further planning. There should be a permanent lination machinery to solve the problems in a rational manner.

iv. *Coordination as the Reciprocal Phenomena:* Coordination as the reciprocal relating to factors in a situation indicates its process. All factors should be related to one another and the inter-relationships among themselves should be considered. Thus Follett regarded an organisation as a system of inter-related parts.

Follett stressed that these four principles should be underpinned by information based on continuous research.

**Elements/Features of Human Relations Theory.**

Human Relations Theory of organisation has three elements:

i. The Individual,

ii. Informal Organisation,

iii. Participative Management.

*The Individual*: The theory recognizes the importance of emotions and perceptions of individuals. The level of workers' production and organisational output is determined by the human relations at work rather than the physical and economic conditions of work. According to Roethlisberger, "Each person is unique. Each is bringing to the job situation certain attitudes, beliefs and ways of life, as well as certain skills — technical, social, and logical. In terms of his previous experience, each person has certain hopes and expectations of his job situation."

*Informal Organisation*: The human relations theory emphasises the informal organisation. As observed by Hicks and Gullet, "The informal shadow organisation that exists within the structure of the formal organisation is emphasised. Attention is focussed on the social aspects of man whose overriding need is seen as a desire to belong, to be accepted by and stand well in his work group".

L.D. White defined an informal organisation as "the set of work relationships that grow out of mutual interactions of persons working together over a long period of time." The points of distinction between informal and formal organisation are:

i. Informal organisation is customary while formal organisation is enacted.

ii. Informal organisation is not written and is not subject to neat diagrams while formal organisation is written, manualized and portrayed in organisational charts.

iii. Informal organisation .tends to be emotional and personal while a formal organisation tends to be rational and impersonal

iv. Informal organisation is spontaneous and societal while formal organisation is planned and legal.

The informal organisation plays a significant role in determining the organisational efficiency. It sets the production norms and behavioural patterns as found in the Bank Wiring Experiment (1931-32). These are:

i. One should not turn out too much work. If one does, one is a "rate-buster".

ii. One should not turn out too little work. If one does, one is a "chiseler."

iii. One should not tell a supervisor anything that will react to the detriment of an associate. If one does, one is a "squealer."

iv. One should not attempt to maintain social distance or act officious. For example, an inspector should not act like one.

Thus human relations theory highlighted the effects of work groups on workers' motivation, satisfaction and productivity. Mayo remarked that man's social situation in his work group ranked first and the work was incidental. Thus, he rejected the David Ricardo's rabble hypothesis which assumes mankind as a horde of unorganized individuals actuated purely by self-interest.

Roethlisberger observed, "Too often we try to solve human problems with non-human tools and in terms of non-human data. It is my simple thesis that a human problem requires a human solution. A human problem to be brought to a human solution requires human data and human tools. Workers are not isolated, unrelated individuals; they are social animals and should be treated as such."

*Participative Management*: The human relations theory advocates the style of participative management, that is, participation of workers in decision-making with regard to their work conditions. In other words, the manager should consult the work groups and their informal leaders before introducing a change of programme (work schedule). This style of management has the following merits:

i. It permits the workers to discuss with supervisors and influence the decisions that affect them.

ii. It develops a sense of participation in the group.

iii. It results in higher productivity,

iv. It makes the working environment more pleasant,

v. It prevents the alienation of workers from management,

vi. It facilitates the acceptance of organisational goals by the workers.

The human relationists advocacy of participative management is in direct contrast to scientific management of F. W. Taylor.

**Classical Vs. Human Relations**

The human relations theory has not rejected or dismissed the classical theory totally. It highlighted the critical gaps in the classical approach and modified and extended certain classical concepts. However, it has rejected the two concepts advocated by the classical theory, viz. .the concept of economic man and formal institutionalization.

The human relationists, like the classical thinkers (traditionalists) have accepted efficiency and productivity as legitimate values of the organisation as well as the role of management in production. As rightly observed by Mohit Bhattacharya, "They differed from the traditionalists in their basic approach to the organisation which they

characterised as a social system consisting of individuals, informal groups and inter-group relationships in addition to the formal structure."

The specific *differences between the classical theory and the human relations theory* are summarised as follows:

***Classical Theory***

1. Emphasises the formal organisation structure

2. Views organisation as a rational and impersonal system.

3. Advocates 'economic man' view of workers.

4. Emphasises the physiological and mechanical aspects of organisation.

5. Believes that organisational behaviour is a product of rules and regulations made by the management.

6. Assumes that people are homogeneous.

7. Emphasises authoritarian style of supervision.

8. Takes the atomistic view of man.

9. States that organisational efficiency depends on the Structure built according to principles.

10. Focusses on the physical environment of the job.

***Human Relations Theory***

1. Emphasises the informal organisation.

2. Views organisation as an emotional and social system,

3. Advocates 'social man' view of workers.

4. Emphasises the sociological and psychological aspects of organisation.

5. Believes that organisational behaviour is a product of attitudes, sentiments and feelings of employees.

6. Assumes that people are heterogeneous.

7. Emphasises democratic style of supervision.

8. Takes the "social view" of man.

9. States that organisational efficiency depends on the human relations and workers' satisfaction and morale.

10. Focusses on the social environment of the job.

**Taylor Vs. Mayo**

Taylor belonged to the scientific management school and Mayo belonged to the human relations school. Mayo's human relations theory emerged mainly out of a set of extended studies (Hawthorne Experiments) in the scientific managemeir traditions of Taylor. He differed from Taylor in his conception of man, focus, orientation, philosophy, motivational assumptions, emphasis and so on. These differences are clearly shown as follows:

***Taylor***

1. He propounded the concept of economic man.

2. He viewed workers as isolated and unrelated individuals.

3. He focused on tools, procedures and rules, that is, physiological and mechanical dimensions.

4. He advocated autocratic management.

5. He assumed the organisational man to be rational and logical.

6. He was concerned with the motivation of the workers only.

7. He advocated the monistic theory of motivation.

8. His main concern was to find one best way of doing tasks.

9. He viewed workers' group as being totally hostile to management.

10. He stressed on technical skills.

11. He subscribed to 'rabble hypothesis' (a passive view of man).

***Mayo***

1. He propounded the concept of social man.

2. He viewed workers as social animals.

3. He focused on people and groups, that is, sociological and psychological dimensions.

4. He advocated participative management,

5. He assumed the organisational man to be social and emotional.

6. He was concerned with the motivation of both managers (employers) as well as workers.

7. He advocated the socio-economic theory of motivation-

8. His main concern was the workers' satisfaction and morale.

9. He did not view workers' group as being hostile to management.

10. He stressed on social skills.

11. He rejected 'rabble hypothesis' and subscribed to 'herd hypothesis'.

However, despite the above differences, Taylor and Mayo had the following similarities:

1. Both attempted to discover the causes of low productivity in the industry.

2. Both believed that harmony and co-operation between workers and management would eliminate the industrial conflicts.

3. Both held that the mistaken view of workers and employers was responsible for the output restrictions (low productivity) of the workers.

4. Both emphasized that the approach of management should be scientific.

5. Both regarded efficiency and economy as the goals of an organisation.

6. Both opposed the industrial conflicts as they obstructed the efficient functioning of organisations.

7. Both were motivated to improve the industrial productivity.

**Critical Evaluation**

The Hawthorne studies and human relations theory have made a landmark contribution to the evolution of administrative thought. Its significance lies in discovering and emphasising the informal organisations groups) which exists in all organisations and facilitate team work and collaboration.

Mayo and his human relations theory were criticised on the following grounds.

i. Alex Carey criticised the Hawthorne experiments for their lack of scientific base as well as for selecting an unreliable small sample of five or six girls to generalise.

ii. The critics say that the behaviour of workers during the experiments was not natural but was influenced by their feelings of importance, attention and publicity they received in the research setting. This is known as Hawthorne Effect, that is, workers react positively and give their best when they know that they are being observed.

iii. Loren Baritz criticised human relationists as pro-management and anti-union. The United Auto workers described them as "cow sociologists".

iv. Amitai Etzioni remarked that "the human relations people tend to devote much attention to informal relations among workers and between workers and supervisors, but little to the formal ones or at the articulation of formal relationships with informal ones."

v. Peter F. Drucker said that the human relationists neglected the nature of work and instead focused on interpersonal relations. He criticised them for not being aware of economic dimensions.

vi. Bendics and Fisher said that Mayo failed to define sharply the ethical pre-suppositions of his scientific

vii. Daniel Sell said that the Harvard Group's methodology was defective,

viii. Critics say that there was no place for tensions and conflicts in the philosophy of Mayo.

ix. Critics say that the human relations theory (Mayoism) could not explore the multi-dimensional phenomenon of human motivation completely,

x. The Marxists say that Mayoism is a new technique to exploit workers as it has deemphasised economic factors.

xi. Critics say that Mayo concentrated more on the members of the organisation and neglected its work and purpose.

xii. The theory is criticised on the ground that it ignored the environmental factors of workers' attitude and behaviour.

.